Control) Order, 1979 as and when the fact relating to difference between price allowed in the formulations and the actual import/procurement price came to the notice of the Government.

(c) to (f) The process of recovery of the amount due from each company is on in accordance with the due procedure of Law. Before arriving at the amount due, bills etc. relating to purchase are required to be verified. Based on such verification the amounts have been worked out in several cases. One of the formulator which was issued such a notice namely, M/s. Fulford India Ltd. have filed writ Petition in the Delhi High Court. The Delhi High Court has granted an interim stay of proceedings against the company and matter is coming up for consideration of admission of the Writ Petition on 9th September, 1985.

(g) and (h) The question of recovery is not linked with the revision in prices of other bulk drugs and formulations produced by a manufacturer.

Unintended benefit on Drugs

2269. SHRIMATI MONIKA DAS: Will the Minister of CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 624 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 29th July, 1985 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that on an average, Rs. 200 per kg. of unintended benefit was made by each company in the import of Tetracycline;

(b) whether it is also a fact that total unintended benefit of around Rupees five crores was made by formulators on Tetracycline during 1981-82, 1982-83 and 1983-84 which should otherwise have gone to consumer;

(c) what are the reasons for not sending claim notices to all formulators who imported or procured Tetracycline at cheap prices; and why only M/s. Hoechst was served with notice;

(d) who are the major ten formulators of Tetracycline, indicating the name of each and under which pack, strength and price each on is marketing it; and

(e) what was the sales turnover of each of Tetracycline formulations and what was the percentage to total sales turnover of company and profit of each during the last three years, yearwise?

THE MINISTER OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL): (a) to (e) Information to the extent available would be collected and laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha.

Verification of Plant and Machinery of Hoechst

2270. SHRIMATI MONIKA DAS: Will the Minister of CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 1231 given in the Rajya Sabha on 13th May, 1985 and state:

(a) when the Technical team visited Hoechst for verification of installation of Plant and Machinery; indicating also the names of the members and whether the report has since been submitted by them;

(b) if so, by when the outcome will be made public;

(c) what was the production of past two years of Baralgan Ketone and the licensed capacity when the company submitted its application for re-endorsement of capacity;

(d) what were the findings of higher achievement of production of the team;

(e) whether the fact of overcharging to the tune of Rs. 20,000 per kg. was considered while allowing re-endorsement of capacity; and

(f) what are the names of other Companies producing Baralgan Ketone and what is their selling price